

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****MAR 21 2007****PATENT
39003.810US01****IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE****In re patent application of:
Gregory A. PICCIONELLI et al.****Group Art Unit: 2165****Examiner: J. C. Opere Abetia****Serial No. 10/659,477****Filed: September 10, 2003****For: REMOTE PERSONALIZATION
METHOD****REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION
UNDER 37 CFR 1.116****Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450****Sir:**

In response to the Office Action dated November 27, 2006, the period for response to which has been extended to March 27, 2007 by virtue of the enclosed petition and payment of the required fee, reconsideration of all pending claims is requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-20 stand finally rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Parker et al. ("Parker"). The PTO again takes the position that Parker identically discloses each element of the present claims. Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of Parker, properly understood, do not identically disclose each and every element of the present claims.

Applicants are compelled to reiterate that Parker does not appear to teach personal preparation of a message by the person who receives the message. Nor does Parker appear to disclose the presence at the site of *any person at all*, still less a person who actually receives the message. Indeed, there does not appear to be the slightest suggestion, let alone explicit disclosure, in Parker concerning the presence of any person at a site at which a personalized photograph or other data file is produced. But it is the very presence at the site of a person to whom a message is provided which is required by present claim 1. Moreover, claim 1 requires not merely the presence at the site of a person to whom a message is provided, but also the active participation of that particular person in the procedure, specifically the preparation of the message by the person for combination with the data file.